

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-26825-2018(O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.09.2018

Jagdeep Singh Sandhu and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Mohit Sadana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harpreet Multani, AAG, Punjab.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

As per office report, respondents No. 1 to 4, 6 and 7 have been duly served in person. Respondent No. 8 has been served through her husband which is also an effective service. Respondent No. 5 could not be served as he was not found residing at the given address.

Learned State counsel submits that the instant petition has rendered infructuous in view of the compromise between the parties.

Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

In case, any complaint is filed by respondents No. 4 to 8 against the petitioners, in that eventuality, the petitioners shall be called in the Police Station after serving one week prior notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C.

28th September, 2018

shabha

[RAMENDRA JAIN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No